

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	, F.	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/719,463 11/21/2003		11/21/2003	Bruce A. Williams	3044-73785	2599	
23643	7590	03/22/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER .	
BARNES (VARGOT, MATHIEU D			
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1732	-	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Oin

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	Office Action Comments	10/719,463	WILLIAMS, BRUCE A.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mathieu D. Vargot	1732				
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address - Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	•	action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
· _							
	 Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
	on Papers	·					
· · ·	·						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
		- · ·	• •				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
'''	The bath of declaration is objected to by the Ex-	arminer. Note the attached Office	Action of form F10-132.				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) 🗌 /	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	* *					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		d in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	4.						
Attachment		4) 🗆 Intanious Summars	(PTO-413)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) 🛛 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper	No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/1 & 4/26/04</u> .	o) [_] Other:					

1.Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17, line 8, "plastic-receiving" should be -plastic-receiving space".

2.The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent 8-132477 (see Figure 6).

The applied reference discloses the instant method of making a molded container with an image-carrying sheet using the instant mold and flow pattern—see Figure 6 therein for the flows and arrangement of the sheet (1), disk-like portion and ridge-like portions (12 and 13) of the flow cavity.

- 3.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent 8-132,477.

Japanese –477 discloses the basic claimed method lacking essentially that the central region of the disk-like space is domed. It is submitted that this design is conventional in

the art and would have been an obvious modification so that the injected resin can be dispersed without affecting the flow properties of the molten resin—ie, the domed area acts a s a buffer for the rest of the injected resin.

4.Claims 1-5, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent 8-132,477 in view of Japanese Patent 2000-6197. The primary reference discloses the basic claimed process lacking essentially the aspect of using "stand-offs" in the mold which help to locate the sleeve. Japanese –197 teaches label retainers (see 3, 6) on the mold which keep the sleeve in place during injecting of the molten resin, projection 6 clearly forming a notch in the molded cup which formed in the bottom of the cup—see line A in Figures 1 and 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Japanese –477 as taught by Japanese –197 to facilitate the placement of the sleeve in the mold cavity.

5.Claims 6, 7, 12,13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent 8-132,477 in view of Japanese patent 2000-6197 and Raymond et al 2005/0053737.

Japanese –477 and –1976 disclose the basic claimed method lacking essentially the aspects of the image-carrying sheet being a lenticular lens sheet, curling the sheet prior to placing it in the mold, and the particular plastic-receiving space recited in instant claims 17-20. Raymond et al teaches these aspects and such would have been an obvious modification to the process of the primary reference dependent on the exact design desired for the label and that for the cup. Clearly, these (ie, the lenticular sleeve

Application/Control Number: 10/719,463 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

and design of the cup) are all well known in the art and one of ordinary skill would have been expected to know of them.

6.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot March 16, 2005 Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

M. Varget

3/16/05